

16

JUST
PRINCIPLES
OF
COMPLYING
With the NEW
Oath of Allegiance.

By a Divine of the Church of England.

Licensed and Entred according to Order.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Richard Baldwin*, near the *Black Bull*
in the *Old-Bailey*. 1 6 8 9.

11:95F

1500 01118 10 0000

JUST PRINCIPLES

Of Complying with the New

Oath of Allegiance.

THE New Oath is certainly an intricate case, and incumbered with no small difficulties: But it will appear unexceptionably lawful, if (without intermeddling with the Politicks of these times) we suppose, that there may be three Parties concern'd in an Oath of Allegiance;

A Ruining-Prince, A Saviour-Prince,
And innocent Subjects.

The terms of *ruining* and *destroying* are ambiguous, and may signify in a lax or strict acceptation; and therefore a Prince may be *ruining* and malicious in several degrees. He may be so far *ruining* and malicious, as to *Abdicate his People from being his People*; whereby he loseth and forfeiteth all Title to them and their Allegiance. * *Exstimar Barclaius amitti Regnum, si Rex vere hostili animo in totius populi exitium servatur, quod concedo; consistere enim simul non possunt voluntas impetrandi & voluntas perdendi; quare qui se hostem*

* Grot. de
J. B. ac P.
l. 1. c. 4.
S. XI.

totius populi proficitur, is eo ipso abdicat regnum. If a King maketh Himself a Destroyer of his whole people, He Abdicaterh the Kingdom (according to Grotius and Barclay) because the Will of destroying is inconsistent with the Will of being their governing Head. It is possible, that a Bigotted, pontifician Prince may not be in this notion a ruining Prince ; for although He manifestly designeth to subvert and extirpate the Protestant Religion, and to introduce his own (which every Prince desireth,) yet He may not design to extirpate the Body of Protestants out of his Kingdom. But the World need not be told, that the Principles of his Religion oblige Him to it ; And 'tis not probable, that the French King's principal Allie would be better natur'd to his Protestant Subjects, than his most Christian Majesty. The sinking calamities which He was gradually introducing, Popery and Gallican Slavery (which have all manner of Evils in the Bowels of them,) as also his Combination with the common Enemy of Christendom, ruinous to the State of Europe, and the Protestant Party in Europe, may justly denominate Him a ruining Prince at a Superlative rate.

The notion of a *Saviour-Prince* usually occurreth in History ; as in the instances of *Ptolomy, Antigonus* and *Demetrius* ~~and~~. Under this notion our present King ought to be consider'd, (which is far more honourable than the style of a King, *de facto*, competent to every vile Usurper ;) nor is He only a Saviour-Prince to these Nations, but to harass'd, afflicted Europe, and the Reformed Churches abroad. A Saviour-Prince may be such before his entrance upon the Government, if with vast expence and hazard He becometh our Redeemer from the calamities of *Popery* and *Arbitrary Power* ; And being seated in the Government, He subsisteth

in

in the quality of a Saviour-King. *A man shall be an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.*

By *innocent Subjects* I understand Subjects unconcern'd in the Revolutions of Government, who cannot be thought under any *Obligatio delicti* to their former King, and who will not fail to judge of all his pretensions *ex æquo & bono*. Subjects are thought incompetent Judges of the Rights of Princes: but they that dare not swear Allegiance to an Usurper against their rightful Sovereign, must take upon them to make a judgment of his Pretensions, that calleth himself by that venerable name. Having thus represented the notion of *Innocent Subjects*, and of *two opposite sorts of Princes*, we may proceed to affirm,

I. If the main of our Allegiance to a Ruining-Prince, out of possession, be ceas'd and expir'd, and the rest be forfeited by Him, it is lawful to swear Allegiance to *the King in possession*. The Law determineth our Subjection and Allegiance to the King in possession: but the same Law (and our Oath also) determineth, who it is, that should be, and be continu'd King in possession. From whence it followeth, That the Duties of Allegiance (which is the business of being Liege-Subjects) are of two sorts: *Bounden Duty to Government*, which is plainly legible in the Law, (*Submission, Obedience, Tribute, Gratitude*, and such more) and *bounden Duty of Friendship and Adherence* to the rightful Governour, commonly call'd *the King de Jure*. If the rightful Governour was by fraud and violence kept out of possession, or unjustly thrown out of place, faithful Subjects (in former Ages) suppos'd themselves under an Obligation to this *Jural King*. Which supposition of theirs was not ill grounded,

as appeareth from the contexture of the old Oath of Allegiance, from our Obligations to Justice, and from the Nature of Fidelity and Friendship (for the relation between Sovereign and Subject is a relation of Friendship, *amicitiæ imparium*;) but to this latter sort of the Duties of Allegiance, a Ruining-Prince out of place can pretend no Title. If He be kept out of possession, faithful Subjects are not bound to introduce Him, but rather to endeavour his legal Exclusion: or if He be thrust out of place, they are not bound to adhere to him, own him, reduce him, fight or struggle for him; they owe him nothing, but may entirely forsake him, and be glad that they are rid of him, for (by seeking their ruin) He hath justly forfeited the Friendship of his innocent people (and therefore the fidelity of their Friendship) and all the Offices of Friendship, which are otherwise due to a rightful Governour out of place. The other sort of Duties of Allegiance, *Duties to Government*, the Law transferreth to the King in possession, and they are deservedly given to a *Saviour-King*. If therefore a Ruining-Prince be out of Place and governing Power, the Bond or Relation between Him and his innocent People is entirely dissolv'd, by a Cessation of one part, and a Forfeiture of the other part of their Allegiance, and the whole business of their Adherence, Fidelity and Allegiance to him is at an end. A faithful Subject will not easily forsake a tolerable Prince: but there may be a Prince of such a character, that there is no owning Him, adhering to Him, or suffering for Him with Honour and Conscience. And if He ought to be intirely forsaken by his innocent Subjects, they are not bound to reserve for Him any Allegiance, nor to make his pretended Rights the matter of their care.

II. There are several *Total* Modes of destroying a King's Right of Regality ; and there are several *Partial* Modes of destroying it, approaching to a *Total* : If by this latter sort of Modes the Competitor-King's Right of Regality be sufficiently destroy'd, innocent Subjects may swear Allegiance to the King in possession.

Suppose a King hath not alienated or given away his Kingdom, nor thrown it away and abandon'd it, nor hath sought in an hostile way the destruction of his whole People, or the Body of them (which are *total* Modes of destroying his Right of Regality ;) yet if it plainly appeareth, that the kindness which he hath for Protestants (the Body of his People) and the usage which He designeth them, cannot be much dissonant from his Neighbours, (*Tell me with whom thou goest, and I will tell thee what thou art, saith the Spanish Proverb.*) This can be thought nothing less than a *partial* Mode of destroying his Right of Regality, approaching to a *total*. If a King hath laid a design (and manag'd it for several years) of ruining his People in every thing that is dear to them, in their *Laws, Liberties, Property and Religion* : This also must be thought a partial Mode of destroying his Right of Regality, approaching to a *total* ; for it approacheth to an *Abdication of his People*. And there is the same reason for *Abdicating the Government*.

The Violation of Laws ought not to be aggravated beyond its just bounds, no more than Recessions from the great Rule of Government, the publick good : but many heinous Violations of the Laws in several great instances ; the assuming a Power of Dispensing with Laws at pleasure ; and a declared resolution not to administer the Government according to Law, are an *Abdicating* the legal English Government in a great degree ; they
are

are such Violations of the Coronation-Oath as approach to a nulling the contract between King and People, (whatever that signifieth ;) And if a Prince affecteth Arbitrariness at such a rate, that nothing less will satisfy him than the administering all things according to his own will, (without regard to Oaths, Laws, Property ;) if he altereth the whole Species of the Government, or manifestly maketh it his design to exterminate it, This is a total Abdication of our legal English Government, and a deposing that officary Dignity, the legal Regality. But that the string may not be over-stretch'd in any thing, let all that hath been done in the late Reign towards the subversion of our constitution, and the introduction of the *French* Mode of Government, be thought nothing more, than a *partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

A King may make such a Recession from the Government, as may be a degree of abandoning the governing of us ; and there may be a fair appearance of a *Conquest of the King* : For although there was no formal Declaration of War upon the King in the *Prince of Orange's* Discent, it seem'd not an hostile aggression, nor any thing more than a request of Right with the Sword in his hand : yet it must be acknowledg'd, that the Prince did expressly declare War against all those that oppos'd his designs (which implieth a Declaration of War upon the King.) the King expressly declar'd War upon the Prince, and therefore they were in the state of War ; the issue whereof was the King's removal from the Government and out of the Kingdom, which carrieth a fair appearance of a *Conquest of the King*. A Conquest of the King is a Mode of total destroying the Right of Regality : But because the Army of Multitudes of the Subjects, and a desertion of the Souldiery, were complicate

cate with the Prince's Arms, we will suppose this appearing Conquest of the King, to be nothing more than *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

If a King be ruining at such a rate, that He is as unfit for Government as an Idiot or Lunatick; and if a Regency be necessary for the safety of the Nation, This must be thought *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

There are some Doctrines in the Roman Church destructive of civil Society; such as the principle of *not keeping Faith with Hereticks*: If any King should expressly own this principle, it would be totally destructive to his Right of Sovereignty in a Protestant Kingdom, (for He could have no Right to demand the Faith and Allegiance of the People; nor could He be a capable object of Faith or Credit, nor of Promises, Contracts, and Oaths:) if he doth not expressly avow this principle; yet if it be highly probable (from many indications) that He is a Man of that principle, This can be thought nothing less than *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

If Kings of the Pontificalian perswasion manage Government at such a rate of Craft and Cruelty, that there is no living for Protestant Subjects in Society with such Sovereigns; insomuch that they have made it matter of dispute, Whether a Nation of Protestants (especially an unenslav'd Nation) be bound to be Liege-Subjects to Kings of such a character, that keep no Faith with them, observe no Rules of Justice towards them, stick at nothing to destroy them, This must be thought *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

If a Ruining-King be thrown out of place, this is a total destroying his Right of Regality in respect of his innocent Liege-Subjects, whose Friendship and Adhe-

rence he hath justly forfeited, as is before discours'd : but because these are only part of the People, let this be thought nothing more than *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.*

If upon a Breach between King and People (justifiable on the People's part) the King recedeth, and there be no place for a *tolerable re-coalition*, nor for any *tolerable projects of Government* consistent with his Allegiance, This can be thought nothing less than *a partial destroying the Right of Regality approaching to a total.* Breaches with the King are not easily reconcilable with the Law of God and of the Land, nor with the Doctrine of the Church of *England* from the rise of the Reformation, *That 'tis not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King.* But doubtless the Doctrine of due Non-resistance ought to be restrain'd to such resistance which is hurtful and destructive to the King (agreeably to the usual sence of that Political Aphorism, *The King can do no wrong*, his Ministers only are accountable and punishable;) it designeth not to abridge the Body of the People of the Right of resisting an extravagant Prince in cases of evident and great necessity; provided, they contain themselves within the limits of just bounding their Prince, and of just Self-defence and Self-security; for beyond these bounds Protestants never pretended to proceed in their Oppositions to their Princes. But there may be a Prince *not to be bounded* or brought to any thing (which is the general sence of Wise men touching our late King,) the Estates of the Realm have adjudg'd, that there was no reducing Him upon terms or conditions, no place for Treaty; they have debated the project of a Regent, and determin'd it impracticable; and that no provision could be made for the Government, but by a new Establishment and a new Allegiance inconsistent

stent with any measure of his Allegiance, supposing them to have proceeded upon great Reasons, and with all imaginable fairness and equity; at what rate hath his late Majesty destroy'd his Right of Regality? For having upon other accounts reduc'd it to multifarious *next to nothings*, He had brought things to such a state upon his Recession, that any further adherence to his Allegiance was become impracticable, and all provisions for the Government consistent with that Allegiance. If it be unlawful to comply with the new Allegiance, it must be Virtue and Duty to contest for some other establishment, consistent with some degree of former Allegiance: but no such Model is yet propos'd, and probably the *Quadrature* of the Circle is of as easie investigation.

These several Modes of destroying the Right of Regality ought to be consider'd, not only confusedly and in an heap, but in orderly connexion and succession one ought to be super-added to another. An imperfect Abdication of the Administration of Government, and an imperfect Conquest may be thought sufficient to extinguish such a Right of Regality, that was before dying and expiring: or if some little of it still seemeth to remain, (yet if the Estates of the Realm have judg'd aright, that all former Allegiance was become impracticable) this little will be nothing more than such a rigor of Right, that in common Equity is not demandable. If upon a full and just computation of things it appeareth, That nothing of the People's Subjection and Allegiance is reasonably and in common Equity demandable by the King out of place, than his Right of Regality must be thought sufficiently destroy'd: The Subjects must be bound to more than *natural* and *reasonable* Subjection and Allegiance, if they be bound to such a degree of Allegiance, which cannot in reason

be demanded; such Allegiance is like a pretended Debt, that in common Equity is not demandable, which no man in Conscience is bound to pay, and which He is absolv'd from before God.

This Account of things pretendeth not to any Authority in the Nation to depose the King, and to absolve the Subjects from their Allegiance, by virtue of our (ancient) English constitution: But it appealeth to common Equity (which is *germana justitia*) touching the total Non-obligation of innocent Subjects from their Allegiance; which is no more a deposing the King than a Debtor's Plea of Absolution in Conscience from an undemandable debt is a deposing his Creditor, or than a Servant's Plea of discharge from an undemandable Service is a deposing his Master.

III. Suppose the Competitor-King's Right of Regality be not reduc'd to none; yet if it be reduc'd to next to none, innocent Subjects may swear Allegiance to the King in possession: For although good Subjects suppose themselves under an obligation, to reserve an Allegiance for an undoubted rightful Governor, yet not for such a Governor that hath either no Right at all, or next to none; for Niceties and Nothings confronted with mighty Motives and Obligations, signify nothing. If the Competitor-King's Title to the Government be so extremely infirm and invalid, it cannot create a valid Obligation upon the Subject to adhere to his Allegiance against the King that is in possession (perhaps upon tolerable fair terms) the Authority of the Nation, publick Determinations, and all the mighty Interests of our Country and Religion.

IV. They that suppose a *Regality* to be justly and necessarily destroy'd, must suppose themselves discharg'd from its Allegiance, and that they may confederate a new Allegiance; for it cannot be said without a contradiction, that

that a *Regality* justly and necessarily destroy'd, retaineth the *Right of Government*, and ought to subsist. Some Ruining-Regalities ought to be bounded only, and reduc'd to reason; others ought to be demolish'd, both upon the account of their vast Maleficence to their Subject-Nations, and because the Interest of the whole necessarily requireth it; which is the case of the late Regality, *A branch of a certain reigning Power and Interest, ruinous to the Nation and to the whole.*

* *No Artificer maketh the whole for a part, but the part for the whole*; and if the part be for the whole, it is Justice and Duty to destroy a part, as Physicians do, *ἵνα τὸ ὅλον*, † *for the necessary conservation of the whole.* It is Justice and Duty to demolish that part of a City whose standing is destructive to the whole (it ought not to subsist;) no wrong or injustice is done to any, if a part be demolish'd, when the safety and interest of the whole necessarily requireth it; for every part and its Rights are for the whole. On the contrary, it would be monstrously unjust and uncharitable, to uphold a Cock-loft to the ruin of the whole House, and to preserve a Cabin to the sinking a Ship. The best Account of our late Revolution and change of Government is, *Duty to the whole*, (which in our case is *Europe*, more especially *Reformed Christendom.*) and the safety thereof necessarily requir'd it.

He is a great stranger to the World, who knoweth not, that of late years there hath been in the World a reigning Power and Interest (the *French-Papal*) ruinous to the whole in all its branches: and that the redemption of these Nations of *Europe*, and of the Protestant Party in *Europe*, from the reigning and ruining Power and Interest of *France* and its Allies, is vastly just and necessary. If this Nation had continu'd subject to that ruining Power and Interest, such a posture would have been ruinous to the rest of Christendom (being employ'd to serve the *French* Interest) which is no tolerable posture of humane affairs. As a branch of that reigning Interest, and because its standing is ruinous

* Philo.

Opusc. p.

153.

† Porphyre.

Ap. Cyrill.

c. Jul. p.

155.

to

to the whole, the late Regality (like an House infected with a fretting Leprosie) ought to be demolish'd.

But although it ought to be demolish'd, yet not in the method of popular Fury (by Subjects taking Arms to depose or destroy their King, and then absolving themselves from their Allegiance) the Christian Religion and Protestant Profession, *Nil nisi justum suadet & lenè*: but a just method will appear in this following Hypothesis. In the late Expedition of our generous Prince, there was a two-fold Design and Undertaking, complicate and conjunct, yet of separate and distinct consideration; the one respecteth *the whole*, the other *a part*; the one was *oppositive* to that reigning Power and Interest, ruinous to the whole; the other was *redressive* of the Grievances of the English Nation. If in order to the first design, the Citizens of the whole (the Estates of *Europe*) combine; if one of their number (an Independent Prince) becometh a kind of Saviour and Redeemer to the sinking estate of Christendom, and undertaketh a design (either by the calmer or severer methods) to break the Power and Interest of the common Enemy of Christendom in this Nation; if in his just Expedition He proceedeth to a removal of his late Majesty, and his Heir, of the *French-Papal* Interest (if he had any) from the Government and Kingdom, there can be nothing unjust in this method of demolishing the *Regality*; nor is it unjust, if good Subjects suffer it to be demolished (both because of their own danger and their paramount obligation to the whole;) nor is it unjust, if the Estates of the Realm add an *Epicrisis*, that his late Majesty's removal from the Government was (in this notion) just and necessary. It is certain, that his removal from the Government (though his Recession was not altogether forc'd and involuntary) was the effect of the Prince's Arms*, and of his Conduct of affairs, and ought chiefly to be ascrib'd thereto; And that in an Exigence of the whole, a

Saviour-

* Driven
out of his
Domini-
ons.
Letter to
a Bishop,
p. 21, 22.

Saviour-Prince may reasonably proceed to so great an extremity, (whereas if a Nation only be in danger of Persecution from their King, their Saviour-Princes usually proceed no further than to divert the present storm ;) And if a Saviour-Prince *justly and necessarily* proceedeth to so great an extremity, the Nation is discharg'd from their former Allegiance ; the Right of Government belongeth no more to his late Majesty, or his (pretended) Heir of the *French* Papal Interest, but our Subjection and Allegiance to that line of Succession is at an end. Which if the Nation be absolv'd from, they necessarily become a *free people (sui juris)* if the next Heirs will make them such, and *the Crown becometh vacant*. The Revolution in this Nation is a Case of the whole, and the Act of the Citizens of the whole. A Transcendental to Civil and Municipal Law, but not the less lawful for being so.

There was a second Design, co-incident in time, concurrent and complicate with the former, (part of it, as the Nation is part of the whole, but of separate consideration from it) *peculiarly redressive of the Grievances of the English Nation*. Multitudes of the Nobility and Gentry of the Nation (intent upon the saving their own Free-hold) address'd a Neighbour-Prince, to come to their rescue from an Hurricane of Popery and Arbitrary Power, and to support the tottering Fabrick of their Government ; they assisted him by Associations and Arms, both Subjects and Souldiers made a defection from the late King, which issu'd in his Recession from the Kingdom, and a Vote of the Convention of the Estates absolving the Nation from their Allegiance. If this Scene of affairs be consider'd as one continu'd Design to demolish the late Regality, it is not justifiable by English Law or English Divinity (It is all one, whether the People demolish the Regality by their own or another's hand :) But this Scene of affairs ought to be distinguish'd into three periods of time ; the Time before
the

the Breach, the Time of the Breach between King and People, and the Time after it. The Time before the Breach necessitated an Address to a Neighbour-Prince, and a Defence of the Establish'd Religion, and Laws, the Lives and Liberties of the Subjects from a violent Rape. During the Time of the Breach, the Affairs of the Kingdom were in suspense, and therefore the Breach may be consider'd as nothing more than a just and necessary Self-defence. In the third period of Time, the Estates of the Realm deliberate touching the remainder of Duty to their with-drawn King, and proceed to a definitive Sentence, *That He had Abdicated the Government, and the Crown was become vacant.* To make the Justice of this definitive Sentence appear, part of it, (the vacating the Crown) ought to be consider'd, not in a separate and solitary notion; but as the late Design *redressive of the Grievances of the Nation* was concurrent with another Design *opposite* to that reigning Power and Interest ruinous to the whole: So I understand this part of the definitive Sentence, only as a *concurrence* with the former Mode of *vacating the Crown*; and in such a notion it is necessarily just, because the former Mode is certainly so. With the former Mode of demolishing the Regality, there was also a concurrence of his late Majesty's *will to be gone*; and his Mode of Recession (leaving no Commissioner, with-drawing the Seals, destroying the Writs for a Parliament) is necessarily a Degree of Abandoning the governing of us. If this Degree of Abandoning the Government be consider'd with its Antecedents (subverting the Constitution, violating the Fundamental Laws, designing his People's ruin, and such more) and also with its Consequent (that no provision can be made for the Government consistent with his Allegiance,) the Sum-total is suppos'd to amount to thus much, *No further Subjection or Allegiance is in equity demandable from the People*: And if no further Subjection or Allegiance of the People be in Equity demandable by the

the King, *He hath Abdicated the Government*. In this notion the late Revolution is of a better appearance than usually changes of Government are: But we will suppose, that in this notion it is not absolutely just; yet because in the former notion, and as to innocent Subjects it is unexceptionably just, therefore a good Man may be rationally satisfy'd, that *the late Regality is justly and necessarily demolish'd*.

V. The King in possession (upon several accounts) may justly demand the Allegiance of the People; not upon the account of *Conquest*, for there is no pretence to the Conquest of the People; the contract also between the Prince of *Orange* and the Nation (which we are * told of) ought to protect the People from any such claim; and altho' his Majesty may be said to have conquer'd our late King, yet not at all as a *common Conqueror*, contesting for *Dominion or Possession*, but as a Saviour-Prince to the Nation and to the whole; agreeably to the style of his *Declaration*, and his publick Profession, that *He came not hither for any Interest, but to save us from Popish slavery*. First therefore his Majesty is justly said to have a degree of Propriety in the People by *Right of Redemption* (having done enough to Merit the Name of a Redeemer of the People) according to the known Sentiments of *Gratitude*, which is the main source of our Obligations. A ruin'd People (actually ruin'd in part, and design'd for further degrees of ruin) *owe themselves to him*, and their former Sovereign deserveth to lose them for ever to a Saviour Prince, having manifestly design'd to make them extremely miserable. In the next place, because of his just Propriety in the People, and because of the vast Beneficence of his Government (which obligeth to the Duties of Gratitude) a Saviour-Prince in possession hath a better Right to the People's Allegiance, than a Natural-unnatural Prince out of place, that hath reduc'd his Right to none, or next to none; and therefore in case of competition, the former is *rather the rightful King*. So if an Heir of the *French-Papal Interest*, (not fairly and legally ascertain'd to

* Letter to
a Bishop,
p. 22.

the Nation) come in competition with the Queen, it is a known rule of the Casuists, *In rebus dubiis melior est conditio possidentis*. Moreover, if the Nation, or the major part of it, be fairly disoblig'd from their former Allegiance, our present King is in the Government by an unexceptionable Right, the Election of a free People. His Majesty hath also an higher Title than any national Law-Title, and is King by an higher Law, (that which is in it self Law;) for in a grand Exigence of the whole (the greatest that ever was) He is in the Government upon the score of a *just and necessary Redemption* of us and of Europe, and therefore ought to be in the Government. A Saviour-Prince in the Government, upon the score of a *just and necessary Redemption of us and of Europe*, is the most desirable thing in this World, and is next door to infinitely just and necessary: All pretensions therefore to National Law-Titles, ought to lay themselves at the feet of his Paramount-Title. And as the late Reign was not for the main a lawful, civil Government (in respect of the Administration,) but a branch of that reigning Power and Interest which is ruinous to us and to the whole: So we confederate Allegiance with our present King, not only as with a lawful King in respect of his Administration (who is to govern us by Law,) but as with a Saviour-Prince unto us and to the whole.

VI. Innocent Subjects, that by the fault of their own Ruining-Prince, are necessitated to crave and live under the Protection of a Saviour-Prince, either at home or abroad, may and ought to become his Liege-People. For a Saviour-Prince may justly demand of all that are necessitated, to crave and live under his Protection, that they make Faith and Allegiance to him: thus far Protection and Allegiance are manifestly reciprocal, *Accipe beneficium, redde debitum*. Which contract of Allegiance with a new Prince (because it is just and necessary) is a just and necessary Abrenunciation of all Allegiance to their former King, which perfectly dissolveth the bond or relation between them. Thus a people perse-

persecuted by their own Prince, betake themselves usually to a Foreign Saviour-Prince (without crime or blame) as their sanctuary and shelter, and give up themselves to his Allegiance. But whether this be done at home or abroad, whether we go to a Saviour-Prince, or a Saviour-Prince cometh to us, it maketh no alteration in the case of innocent Subjects. They may be necessitated to crave and live under the Protection of a Saviour-Prince at home, to shelter them from a reigning Power and Interest (ruinous to them and to the whole,) of which their natural Prince is a branch. And they that are rationally satisfy'd, that this is indeed their case, may conscientiously give up themselves to a new Allegiance. Which may be done with greater satisfaction upon the account of those additional Considerations: By complying with the new Oath, we do nothing at home now, but what must have been done abroad within a while (perhaps before this time) if his late Majesty had continu'd in the Government.

If by a non-compliance with it, Protestants should fall into divisions, and *Popery* should once more regain the Throne, who shall answer for the tremendous consequences? Some suppose, it was the duty of the *Convention of Estates* to deliver themselves effectually, when Providence gave them an opportunity, and to rid their hands of *Popery* for ever, because of the inhumanity which it involveth: if this be doubtful, yet it is past doubt, that every good Man will be loath to advise or contribute to the re-enthroning it.

VII. A Ruining-King out of place, cannot be thought King *de jure*, when his non-reigning condition must be thought, *de jure*, perpetual. If having before invalidated his own Right, and reduc'd it to nothing, or next to nothing; such a Prince persevereth (for a considerable tract of time, past all hope of better) a branch of that Power and interest which is ruinous to the Nation and to the whole; It is reasonable to suppose him irrecoverably such, and that a non-reigning condition ought to be to him perpetual (for He can have no Right to reign, but in consistence with the safety of the Nation

Nation and of the whole;) And if the business of his reigning *in point of Right* be at an end, then his innocent People's Allegiance is also at an end.

But if any should suppose, that his Right is not totally extinct, that still they ought to reserve some little Allegiance for him; yet when the Nation is generally under a new Oath, that little is become utterly impracticable, and therefore may be safely dismiss'd.

Upon these Principles I have proceeded in complying with the new Oath (without extenuating the sense of it, which is to render it ineffectual to the support of the Government) making a Protestation against the King-deposing Doctrines and the rest of the wild Fanatick Principles of the Age; not receding (so far as I know) from the sound Doctrine of Protestants touching Duty to Government, nor from the Doctrine of the Church of *England* (which is no longer valuable then as she retaineth her Virtue and Glory;) not conjuring up again any evil spirits of the late times; not going to School to *Mariana* to learn Theology and Politicks; not pretending to swear Allegiance to any King *de facto* (*quo jure quave injuria*) to swear, unswear and swear again as the times turn; not acknowledging Protection and Allegiance perfectly reciprocal, as if it was lawful and consistent with virtue to abandon the best of Princes when unable to protect us; which is an abandoning the due adherence to justice, and can be nothing better than the crime of abandoning our Sovereign Friend when he falleth into adversity. God forbid that Protestants should ever part with their sound Doctrine and Principles (which no deliverance can compensate the loss of,) that the Consciences of Men should be debauch'd in matters of Morality and Virtue (which are far more valuable than States and Kingdoms;) or that the Oath, for want of clear Principles of Justice to proceed upon, should be matter of scruple to any good Men, that are not prepar'd to swallow Camels.

T H E E N D.

